REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action and citations have been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

"Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103"

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the claims in view of Ackley, Teufel *et al.* and Wright, Jr. We respectfully submit that we do not believe that the skilled person would combine the teaching of these documents and in any event do not believe the combination renders the invention defined in the independent claims obvious. However, in order to obtain speedy allowance of the case, we have amended the independent claims 1, 9, 29, 37, 57 and 90 to provide further distinctions over the prior art.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that:

- the drawing field is a drawing input field;
- the coded data is at least partially indicative of the drawing input field; and
- that the movement data represents drawing input by the user.

As basis for these amendments can be found on page 31, line 30 to page 36, line 1, which clarifies the nature of the drawing field and the user input, whilst page 20, lines 1 to 26, clarifies that the coded data represents an identity, which may represent a user interface element, such as a drawing input field, or may represent the interface surface, with the layout of the surface being used to identify the drawing input field, as described for example on page 30, lines 11 to 14.

As will be appreciated by the Examiner both Ackley and Teufel *et al.* relate to detection devices which are capable of detecting printed encoded information. Thus, for example Ackley is capable of detecting barcodes and other such input representations, whereas Teufel *et al.* is adapted to scan text. However, neither of these documents shows an input device which allows a user to provide a drawing input represented by movement of the sensing device. In this regard a drawing input should be contrasted to scanning predetermined text as occurs in Teufel *et al.*

As far as Wright is concerned, this document does not describe moving a sensing device with respect to an interface service including coded data which is at least partially indicative of the drawing input field and which is used to determine movement of the sensing device. In view of this, we submit that this document is not relevant to the claims as revised.

Thus, none of the documents describe an interface surface including coded data which is used to determine at least movement data representing drawing input by the user and which is at least partially indicative of the drawing input field. In this regard, we would highlight that the system described in Wright *et al.* does not include an interface surface with coded data.

In any event, we do not believe that it would be obvious to combine the teaching of these three documents. In particular, Ackley and Teufel *et al.* relate to devices for detecting specific printed data arrangements and do not relate to a device for enabling user interaction with computer software by allowing the user to input drawing using the sensing device. In contrast to this, Wright *et al.* relates to a sensing system which operates utilising an input screen and associated pen. This is not therefore adapted for use with printed materials or the like as in the case of Ackley and Teufel *et al.*, and in view of this, we submit it would be obvious to combine the teaching of these documents.

Even in the event that the documents were combined by the skilled person, this would not result in the teaching of the present invention. In particular, the natural consideration would be to provide a screen and input device arrangement similar to that used in Wright *et al.* but to allow the detection of certain data, such as barcodes displayed thereon. Even in the event that the skilled man would consider modifying the sensing devices of Ackley and Teufel, this would not teach allowing a user to input drawing by moving the sensing device with respect to coded data, as the coded data in these documents is adapted to represent specific page elements and is not intended for detecting movement of the sensing device.

In view of the amendments made to claim 1, similar amendments have also been made to the remaining independent claims 9, 29, 37, 57 and 90 and similar comments therefore also apply.

In any event, in order to provide further distinctions over the prior, new dependent claims 127 and 138 have been added. Claim 127 relates to the sensing device generating different data and position data in accordance with moving of the sensing device as described for example on page 27 of the applications as filed. Similarly, claim 128 relates to the fact that the method includes printing the interface surface with a printer. This is described for example on page 23 of the application as filed and is again not described in any of the prior art documents.

Claim 129 clarifies that the indicating data represents at least an identity of the interface surface, and that the text input field may be determined based on a description of the interface surface and the position or movement of the sensing device. This is described for example on page 20.

Claim 130 to 138 are equivalent claims depending on the independent claims 29, 37, 57 and 90 we submit that these claims define further distinctions over the prior art and will therefore provide the basis for patentable subject matter should the Examiner maintain objections against the independent claims.

Appln No. 09/575,172
Amdt. Dated February 10, 2004
Response to Office action of October 21, 2003   19

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

_____

PAUL LAPSTUN

_____

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
              393 Darling Street
              Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762